

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/918,463 08/01/2001 Yongju Jung 1567.1014 2888 **EXAMINER** 49455 7590 03/15/2006 STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP DOVE, TRACY MAE 1400 EYE STREET, NW **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005 1745

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/918,463	JUNG ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Tracy Dove	1745

	Tracy Dove	1745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 February 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS		•	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the following places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	of Appeal. To avoid ab offidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverser, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I AMENDMENTS	pe filed within the time period set for	orth in 37 CFR 41.37(	a).
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	ef. will not be entered	because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	•		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	ejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	· ———		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	illowable il submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendin	ieni canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,7-16,19,20,23,26 and 32-37</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b	ut before or on the date of filing a l	Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u>	not be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperty and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10.	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	it does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	

Continuation of 13. Other: Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 27-31 have been canceled. All rejections regarding these canceled claims are withdrawn. All 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, rejections contained in the final action of 12/1/05 are withdrawn in light of the after final amendment of 2/28/06 which has been entered.

Applicant argues the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Evans should be withdrawn. Examiner points out the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)/103(a) in view of Evans. See Final rejection for the reasons of record. Evans teaches preferred solvents for the electrolyte include sulfolane (strong polar), acetonitrile (strong polar), tetrahydrofuran (lithium protect), methyl tetrahydrofuran (weak polar), dioxolane (lithium protect), 3-methyl-2-oxazolidone (strong polar), propylene carbonate (strong polar), butyrolatone (strong polar), ethylene glycol sulfite (strong polar), dimethylsulfite (strong polar), dimethyl sulfoxide and dimethyoxyethane (weak polar) (4:28-39). Therefore, Applicant's argument that Evans fails to teach or suggest the strong polar solvent of the claimed invention is not convincing.

Applicant argues Evans does not teach a positive active material comprising a sulfur-based compound. However, Be2Fe2S5 and Bi2Pb2S5 are sulfur based compounds. See also paragraph 0028 of the present specification.

The prior art (Evans) teaches the solvents of the claimed invention, the Examiner does not rely on "substituting equivalents". MPEP 2144.06 is improperly applied to the claimed invention and rejections of record.

/ TRACY DOVE PRIMARY EXAMINE

3/04